

Remarks

Claims 1, 3-8, 10-13, 17, and 19-23 are pending in the present application. Reconsideration and allowance are requested in view of the above amendments and the remarks below. Applicants do not acquiesce in the correctness of the rejections and reserve the right to present specific arguments regarding any rejected claims not specifically addressed. Furthermore, Applicants reserve the right to pursue the full scope of the subject matter of the original claims in a subsequent patent application that claims priority to the instant application.

Claims 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Virta (U.S. 2005/0065832) in view of Wies et al. (U.S. 7,159,008), hereafter "Wies."

To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.

In this case, the rejection is defective because Virta and Wies, taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose each and every feature of the claims. Further, there is no suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to

modify the reference or to combine reference teachings in the manner suggested by the Examiner.

In the rejection, the Examiner alleges that Virta and Wies are “in the same field of invention.” Applicants strenuously disagree. Virta is directed to a method and system for reserving a user’s personal time in an electronic schedule of the user. Wies, on the other hand, is directed to a chat interface with haptic (touch) feedback. Clearly Virta and Wies are not “in the same field of invention” as alleged by the Examiner. Indeed, the Examiner has not provided any evidence in support of this allegation. Virta and Wies are directed to completely different fields of invention, namely, electronic schedules and chat interfaces. Virta does not disclose chat interfaces, while Wies is completely silent with regard to electronic schedules.

Claim 1 sets forth:

“A method for comparing free time for members of a chat, comprising:

storing individual calendars corresponding to each member of the chat and at least one person who is not a member of the chat;

initiating a free time comparison in response to an actuation of a selection mechanism via a chat interface, the chat interface comprising a chat area for displaying a dialog between the members of the chat;

combining the individual calendars corresponding to each member of the chat and the at least one person who is not a member of the chat into a free time summary calendar, wherein the free time summary calendar indicates at least one of free time periods that are simultaneously available to all of the members of the chat and the at least one person who is not a member of the chat and conflict time periods during which at least two chat members simultaneously have an event scheduled; and

enlarging the chat interface and displaying the free time summary calendar adjacent to the chat area of the chat

interface.”

Applicants submit that Virta is completely silent with regard to instant messaging chats. As such, Virta cannot possibly disclose the claimed **“combining the individual calendars corresponding to each member of the chat into a free time summary calendar and the at least one person who is not a member of the chat, wherein the free time summary calendar indicates at least one of free time periods that are simultaneously available to all of the members of the chat and the at least one person who is not a member of the chat and conflict time periods during which at least two chat members simultaneously have an event scheduled.”**

In order to remedy these admitted and glaring deficiencies of Virta, the Examiner relies on the disclosure of Wies. In particular, the Examiner alleges that it would be obvious to combine the chat interface with haptic feedback (col. 2, lines 5-15) of Wies with Virta because the combination would provide “a user calendar database for integrating data from the personal time recorder and the interval storage unit into the electronic schedule (see Virta; par. [0015], lines 5-8).” Applicants strenuously disagree with the Examiner’s conclusion.

As stated above, Virta is completely silent with regard to instant messaging chats. Accordingly, one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to combine the chat interface of Wies with Virta in the manner suggested by the Examiner. Further, although Virta discloses the provision of “a user calendar database for integrating data from the personal time recorder and the interval storage unit into the electronic schedule” (see Virta; par. [0015], lines

5-8), such a user calendar database **is not associated with, nor used in any manner in/by, an instant messaging chat or instant messaging interface**, such as that disclosed by Wies. Similarly, the chat interface of Wies is not associated with, nor used in any manner in/by, a calendar database, such as that disclosed by Virta. Clearly, therefore, one skilled in the art would not be motivated, absent the teachings of the present patent application, to combine Virta and Wies in the manner suggested by the Examiner.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that independent claim 1 and its corresponding dependent claims are allowable. Applicants further submit that independent claims 8, 14, and 17 are allowable for reasons similar to those set forth above with regard to independent claim 1.

With respect to the dependent claims, Applicants herein incorporate the arguments presented above with respect to the independent claims from which the claims depend. The dependent claims are believed to be allowable based on the above arguments, as well as for their own additional features.

Applicants submit that each of the pending claims is patentable for one or more additional unique features. To this extent, Applicants do not acquiesce to the Examiner's interpretation of the claimed subject matter or the references used in rejecting the claimed subject matter. Additionally, Applicants do not acquiesce to the Examiner's analysis, combinations, and modifications of the various references or the motives cited for such combinations and modifications. These features and the appropriateness of the Examiner's combinations and modifications have not been separately addressed herein for brevity. However,

Applicants reserve the right to present such arguments in a later response should one be necessary.

If the Examiner believes that anything further is necessary to place the application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/ John A. Merecki /

Dated: March 25, 2008

John A. Merecki
Reg. No. 35,812

Hoffman, Warnick & D'Alessandro LLC
75 State Street, 14th Floor
Albany, NY 12207
(518) 449-0044 - Telephone
(518) 449-0047 - Facsimile